DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 077 957 TM 002 766

TITLE	Analysis and Follow-Up of 1969-70 Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION	New Mexico State Dept. of Education, Santa Fe. Div. of Research and Development.
PUB DATE	13 Nov 70
NOTE	11p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; *Followup Studies; *Program Evaluation; Public Schools; *School Districts; *School Improvement; State Programs; Technical Reports
IDENTIFIERS	*New Mexico

ABSTRACT

Thirty-one school districts and Albuquerque High School and its feeder schools were evaluated in 1969-70 on 24 areas and 23 aspects of these areas, making possible a total of 552 recommendations for improvement. Districts surveyed ranged from a maximum of 178 recommendations to a minimum of 69. Program enrichment was found to be the area of greatest need. Recommendations were also made for greater leadership in administration, subject area committees and department chairmen, updated texts and materials, additional staffing, and redistricting. As a followup a team visited each school in October 1970. Reaction to the evaluation and followup varied. Most team members reported cordiality and cooperation from administrators. In most districts, those recommendations that could be implemented without additional expenditures had already been made. A few evaluators reported encountering opposition or hostility to some recommendations, either directly, through criticism of evaluation procedures or personnel, or indirectly, through establishing committees to study the report and make recommendations. Statistical data related to the evaluation is attached. (KM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 077957

TM 002 266

ANALYSIS AND FOLLOW-UP OF 1969-70 EVALUATION REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Research and Development Division
State Department of Education
State Capitol Building
Santa Fe, New Mexico

November 13, 1970

ANALYSIS OF 1969-70 EVALUATION REPORTS

Thirty-one school districts and Albuquerque High School and its feeder schools were evaluated in the first implementation of Senate Bill 1. For purposes of this analysis the subjects covered have been somewhat arbitrarily divided into 24 areas listed in the Minimum Standards and 23 aspects of these areas, making possible a total of 552 recommendations for improvement in each district if every section had been checked. Districts surveyed ranged from a maximum of 178 recommendations to a minimum of 69. Rankings of areas of concern follow:

NO. OF REC.:	AREAS EVALUATED:	NO. OF REC.:	ASPECTS OF THESE AREAS:
378	Administration	405	Program Enrichment
304	Physical Education	332	Coordinator and/or Committee
299	Science	285	Vertical-horizontal articulation, K-12
275	Language Arts		
270	Music	280	Texts, supplementary material
261	Art	274	Counseling, testing, scheduling grouping
223	Social Studies		
218	Health	269	Plant, basic equipment
204	Math	241	Curriculum guide
197	Media	210	In-service training
180	Foreign Languages	206	Facilities, equipment
165	Guidance	205	Methodology and/or supervision
147	Business and Office	173	Objectives
146	Federal programs	140	Specialists
135	Home Economics	137	Philosophy
129	Industrial Arts	134	Community relations
90	Special Education	126	Budgeting
90	Agriculture	111	Media
56	Trades and Industry	108	Staffing, aides, etc.
41	Driver Training	70	Ratios
27	Student Activities	56	Health and safety
22	Indian Education	48	Preparation
20	Distributive Education	13	Language laboratories
15	Health Occupations	12	Redistricting, reorganization
		9	Food Services

Program enrichment was the area of greatest need. Additional course offerings were suggested in practically all subject matter areas. Special opportunities for underpriviledged children and courses for the non-college bound in language arts and math were priority items. Additional vocational courses were also needed in the 32 schools. In-service training and released time for teachers to visit successful programs in other schools were mentioned 210 times. Teachers were urged to join professional organizations and subscribe to professional publications or have the schools include this item in the budget.

The administration in 28 districts was charged with failure to provide leadership and direction. Lack of philosophy and objectives was mentioned frequently in this connection, and it would seem that these are needed in most districts, clearly stated and well publicized. Lack of communication was also cited as a problem. Administrators in 20 districts were faulted for not providing adequate supervision and for not encouraging new and innovative methods of instruction.

Subject area committees and department chairmen are needed to provide curriculum guides and vertical-horizontal articulation from kindergarten through grade 12 in every subject matter area. Curriculum coordinators are needed in several school districts. Counselors should be included in curriculum planning. Testing, evaluation, and placement are all matters that should be considered in curriculum preparation and planning. Special grouping and innovative methods also should be included in the planning.

Updated texts and supplementary lesson materials were needed in many areas, particularly language arts and social studies. Need for better facilities and equipment was mentioned 206 times, also more extensive use of available equipment. Language laboratories particularly were not being used to best advantage. Audio-visual aids were neglected in many areas. It was recommended that all teachers be informed of the amount budgeted for their program so that they could plan special purchases to enhance the educational experiences of their students.

Additional staffing was needed, particularly in the areas of elementary counseling, libraries, art, and music. Aides were also needed in libraries. Pupil-teacher ratios needed adjustment in physical education classes and some vocational classes. There was a need for additional school nurses in 10 schools. Health education needs to be separated from physical education at the secondary level, and at the elementary level a physical education curriculum needs to be developed. Too many schools substitute supervised play or recess for required physical education courses. At the secondary level, physical education needs to be differentiated from organized athletics. More attention needs to be given to the curriculum for girls' p.e., and emphasis should be placed on lifetime carry-over sports rather than organized athletics.

Redistricting was mentioned 12 times, more particularly reorganization within districts to make more efficient use of existing buildings or to adjust to changing school populations. Community relations were mentioned 134 times, not only in the sense of improved public relations between

school and community through increased communication, but with the idea of using community resources to enrich the educational product, i.e., tours to spots of local interest, lectures by qualified citizens, and expansion of vocational programs. It was suggested that in some of the more isolated districts the school library might remain open during the summer to provide a service to communities with no public library.

School districts with a high percentage of Indian students were advised to make greater efforts to involve the parents of these students in school affairs, to increase participation of Indian students in class activities, and to schedule buses so they might have an opportunity to take part in extra-curricular programs. Student activities in general were criticized for not offering meaningful experiences to a majority of the pupils.

These were the main points. A more detailed report was prepared in an attempt to find some correlation between number of recommendations made in the academic, vocational, and counseling areas and type of program offered, total district expenditure, pupil-teacher ratio, mobility rate, and absentee rate, and nothing of statistical significance was discovered.

See tables 1 and 2.

FOLLOWUP OF THE 1969-70 EVALUATION OF 32 DISTRICTS

As a followup to the evaluations, a team was appointed to visit each school in October 1970 to discuss the progress made in implementing the recommendations contained in the evaluation reports, and to report back to the Research and Development Division by October 31. Lists of the questions covered and the team members and their assignments are included in this report.

As might be anticipated, reaction to the evaluation and followup varied widely from district to district. A majority of the team members reported a cordial reception and fine cooperation from the administrators visited. Some of the benefits derived from the visitations, as perceived by the school people, were that they pointed out areas where improvement was needed, gave administrators clearcut objectives, reinforced the superintendent's position in correcting deficiencies he might already have been aware of, and aided in securing supplemental funds from the Public School Finance Division. The safety inspection was mentioned by three schools as being most helpful in calling attention to areas of great need.

In most districts, those recommendations which could be implemented without additional expenditure of funds, such as rescheduling, better maintenance, improved communications, and establishment of coordinating committees, have already been taken care of. Some districts have passed bond issues for building programs to relieve crowded conditions, and others are planning to initiate such action. For those recommendations requiring budgetary adjustments, several superintendents report they

have received much assistance from the Chief, Public School Finance Division, in making necessary transfers of funds and in the allocation of supplementary funds.

On the negative side, a few evaluators reported encountering opposition or hostility to some of the recommendations contained in the reports. It was felt that some administrators were not making a real effort to implement the recommendations. One new superintendent in a rather conservative district is having to proceed with care in attempting any innovations. In other districts committees have been appointed to study the report and make recommendations, apparently more as a delaying tactic rather than a sincere attempt at implementation.

Direct criticism of the evaluation procedure included comments that some of the evaluation team personnel did not understand the problems of the district, particularly if they were from a larger district or of a different ethnic background, and that their impractical suggestions and unprofessional attitude made a bad impression.

It was also strongly recommended by one district that no person should be assigned to an evaluation team in a school in which he has formerly worked.

Eighteen districts reported pupil gain at or above grade level; 12 reported below grade level achievement; and 2 did not supply this information.

Table 3 summarizes responses by districts to the questions asked by the evaluators. A lack of uniformity in collecting and reporting data is evident. Neverthless, progress is indicated in the columns headed "Recommendations -- Number for Immediate Implementation," totaling 1487, and "Number for Future Implementation," totaling 584. "Number Unable to Implement" includes those considered completely unrealistic due to excessive cost, lack of understanding of local conditions, or difference in philosophy between local school personnel and evaluators.

Those schools evaluated in March, April, and May did not receive written reports on the findings of the teams in time to do much planning before school was out. It is anticipated that future visitations will show continued progress in meeting recommendations.

SUGGESTED QUESTIONS FOR FOLLOW-UP

1. Number of recommendations contained in the report, as identified by the district.

2. Number selected for implementation. Specify areas.

3. What progress has been made in meeting recommendations? How has this been measured?

4. What additional cost to the district has been involved?
   Actual _____ Anticipated _____

5. Pupil gain data.
   What district-wide tests have been administered (by name)? At what grade levels?

1969-70 EVALUATION FOLLOW-UP

MRS. BLANCHE COLLIE	TATUM EUNICE CARLSBAD
MR. DELMAR SMITH	BLOOMFIELD FARMINGTON CUBA
MR. GENE WHITLOCK	CAPITAN CLOUDCROFT HATCH
MR. WELDON PERRIN	PECOS POJOAQUE
MR. FRANK READY	QUESTA ESPANOLA
MR. DON CLARK	EAST & WEST LAS VEGAS
MR. ROLLIE HELTMAN	SPRINGER CLAYTON OJO CALIENTE
MRS. JEAN PADILLA DR. JEAN LEGANT	ALBUQUERQUE
MR. DOYLE EAKENS	LORDSBURG SILVER CITY COBRE
DR. WOODY MAYHON	VAUGHN MELROSE SANTA ROSA
MR. BILL CAPERTON	FT. SUMNER PORTALES
DR. P. H. BARCK	LOVINGTON MORIARTY
MR. C. M. HILL	GRANTS DEMING TRUTH OR CONSEQUENCES

TABLE 1

THE FOLLOWING TABLE SHOWS THE CORRELATIONS BETWEEN PAIRS OF STATISTICS

			r
P_1	Average Experience of Teachers Total Number of Teachers	=	-.2087
P_2	Average Experience of Teachers Average Salary	=	.1357
P_3	Average Experience of Teachers Pupil/Teacher Ratio	=	-.217
P_4	Average Experience of Teachers Teacher Turnover	=	-.4524
P_5	Average Experience of Teachers Absentee Rate	=	-.0997
P_6	Average Experience of Teachers Mobility Rate	=	.3323
P_7	Total Number of Teachers Average Salary	=	.524
P_8	Total Number of Teachers Pupil/Teacher Ratio	=	.4398
P_9	Total Number of Teachers Teacher Turnover	=	.0802
P_{10}	Total Number of Teachers Absentee Rate	=	.1865
P_{11}	Total Number of Teachers Mobility Rate	=	.095
P_{12}	Average Salary Pupil/Teacher Ratio	=	-.134
P_{13}	Average Salary Teacher Turnover	=	-.2055
P_{14}	Average Salary Absentee Rate	=	-.2614
P_{15}	Average Salary Mobility Rate	=	-.0041
P_{16}	Pupil/Teacher Ratio Teacher Turnover	=	-.0826
P_{17}	Pupil/Teacher Ratio Absentee Rate	=	.1078
P_{18}	Pupil/Teacher Ratio Mobility Rate	=	.035
P_{19}	Teacher Turnover Absentee Rate	=	.1438
P_{20}	Teacher Turnover Mobility Rate	=	.16
P_{21}	Absentee Rate Mobility Rate	=	.2586

Base line data taken from Progress Report,
May, 1970 - N.M. STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

32 Schools evaluated - 1969-70

TABLE 2

CATEGORY	FREQUENCY	MEAN	MEDIAN (Approx.)	MODE	MAXIMUM	MINIMUM	RANGE	STANDARD DEVIATION
Average Experience of Teachers	31	13.14	14.	15.72	7.36	- 5.64	13.	2.8464
Total Number of Teachers	31	185.	1496.5	4119.5	2792.23	-168.77	2961.	515.8692
Average Salary	31	7703.81	7605.5	7408.88	790.19	-986.81	1777.	433.9772
Pupil/Teacher Ratio	31	22.04	20.5	17.42	5.46	- 8.54	14.	2.7339
Teacher Turnover	31	20.67	22.85	27.21	16.83	- 12.47	29.3	7.9021
Absentee Rate	31	4.98	4.55	3.69	1.82	- 2.68	4.5	.9576
Mobility Rate	31	28.23	34.95	48.39	34.07	- 20.63	54.7	11.1119

Mean $= \frac{\Sigma X}{N}$

Standard Deviation $= \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma X^2}{N}}$

Correlation Study
July, 1970
Evaluation Unit
Division of Research & Development

32 Schools Evaluated in 1969-70